

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

RICHARD GOLDEN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JANG H. LIM,

Defendant.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

No. 16-cv-02440

Judge Andrea R. Wood

**ORDER**

Movant Bishop Diehl & Lee Ltd.'s motion to quash [67] is denied. Movant shall have until 3/8/2017 to respond to the citations to discover assets. See the accompanying Statement for details.

**STATEMENT**

Movant Bishop Diehl & Lee Ltd. seeks to quash citations to discover assets in its possession purportedly belonging to judgment-debtor Jang H. Lim. The firm asserts that any response to the citations risks disclosure of attorney-client privileged material and violation of its ethical obligations under Rule 1.6 of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct, which generally prohibits the revelation of information relating to the representation of a client without the client's consent.

This Court previously overruled the objection to disclosure based upon the professional conduct rules, noting that Rule 1.6(b)(6) allows disclosure pursuant to a court order. (Dkt. No. 86.) The Court further directed Movant to provide a log describing on an item-by-item basis any materials in its possession responsive to the citations, along with the basis for any claim that the items should be protected from disclosure. The log provided by Movant identifies 24 documents; for each, Movant cites as the basis for its objection to disclosure the same professional conduct rule previously determined by the Court to pose no bar to disclosure. The log did not suggest that any of the listed documents should be protected from disclosure based on the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product protection, and this Court's review of the descriptions in the log reveals no apparent basis for the assertion of any such privilege or protection. The Court also notes that, subsequent to Movant's submission of the log, the parties were provided an opportunity to submit additional briefing to address the log's contents. (Dkt. No. 105.) Movant failed to file such a brief as permitted by the Court's order. Movant's motion to quash (Dkt. No. 67) is accordingly denied.

Dated: February 22, 2017



Andrea R. Wood  
United States District Judge